UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,047	07/10/2006	Wilhelmus Josephus Bronnenberg	2004P00102WOUS	5252

24737   7590   03/28/2012
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER
JOHN, CLARENCE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2443	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/28/2012	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

vera.kublanov@philips.com
debbie.henn@philips.com
marianne.fox@philips.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/597,047	BRONNENBERG ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CLARENCE JOHN	2443	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 March 2012</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____ ; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

5) ☒ Claim(s) <u>13-32</u> is/are pending in the application.
    5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
7) ☒ Claim(s) <u>13-32</u> is/are rejected.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
9) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since

this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the

fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous

Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's

submission filed on 3/8/2012 has been entered.

Status of Claims

This action is responsive to an RCE filed on March 8, 2012. Claims 13-32 are

pending.

Response to Arguments

1.   The Applicant's arguments filed on 2/27/2012 have been fully considered

but they are not persuasive and do not place the Application in condition for

allowance.

2.   With respect to Claim 13, the Applicant argues that Pham does not teach

searching the removed information describing characteristics of content that

cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices.

3.   **In reply,** the Examiner states that Pham does teach the above limitations.

(Figure 1, Figure 2, Figure 12 – filter packet 252, packet data 246, Page 3 –

paragraph [0036], paragraph [0038], Page 8 – paragraph [0069]). Pham teaches

a Network Infrastructure to perform a variety of operations to maintain the

smooth flow of network traffic through the Internet and private Intranets. Pham

also teaches processors performing filtering and routing of network data

packets received at the network connections to the local area network as well as

the Internet. The network data packet is the content which includes the

information describing characteristics. The IP header 250 in Figure 12 examines

the data packet which is the content, discriminates and filters out the data which

is the removed information that are not to be passed through the VPN gateway

72. The filtered data packet in block 258 does not contain SA parameters. Only

the data packets that are to be passed through the VPN gateway contain SA

parameters. The filtering and routing of network data packets or contents are

performed by network processors. These network data packets are the content

which include the information describing characteristics that are not rendered by

any of the plurality of network rendering devices.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth
in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the

prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 13, 15, 17, 19, and 22 - 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Pham et al. (US 2003/0074473) in view of Hughes et al.

(US 6,065,055).

5.   With respect to Claim 13, Pham teaches a method of filtering and storing

information describing characteristics of content stored on at least one network

device and accessible via a network, said content being potentially useable by a

plurality of network rendering devices adapted for rendering content, the method

comprising the steps of : filtering the information describing characteristics of the

stored content to yield filtered information devoid of information describing

characteristics of content (Figure 1, Figure 2, Page 3 – paragraph [0036],

paragraph [0038], Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-12) that cannot be rendered

by at least any of the plurality of network rendering devices; (Page 5, paragraph

[0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor

84 which cannot be provided by the previous network processor 92);   storing in a

content directory the filtered information devoid of information describing

characteristics of content that cannot be rendered by any of said plurality of

network rendering devices; (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-6]); storing

removed information removed by the filtering (Page 5 – paragraph [0050]. Here,

the network processors include a high speed memory providing a dynamic data

store for accumulated routing and filtered information. The routing of filtered

content or network data is stored in the dynamic data store); and searching or

browsing the content directory to review said filtered information devoid of

information describing characteristics of content that cannot be rendered by any

of the plurality of network rendering devices; (Page 7, paragraph [0064], Page 8,

paragraph [0068] lines 14-19); and searching the removed information describing

characteristics of content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of

network rendering devices (Figure 1, Figure 2, Figure 12 – filter packet 252,

packet data 246, Page 3 – paragraph [0036], paragraph [0038], Page 8 –

paragraph [0069]); wherein said searching or browsing of the content directory

to review said filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by

any of the plurality of network rendering devices is performed independently

(Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the

control processor 84 which is performed independently); about the content to

yield filtered information devoid of information describing characteristics of

content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering

devices. (Page 7, paragraph [0064], Page 8, paragraph [0068] lines 14-19).

6.   Pham teaches the limitations of Claim 13 as described above. However,

Pham does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering.

Conversely, Hughes teaches the above limitation.   Hughes teaches

incrementing the filter hits during scan interval. (Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-

67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5

minutes.   i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is the periodic filtering set by the

Administrator on the Proxy monitor. The scan and filter functions are checked in the Proxy monitor configuration and the scan interval is set to 5 minutes).

7.   Pham and Hughes have common grounds of teaching about filtering and storing information on servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hughes with Pham in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

8.   With respect to Claim 15, Pham and Hughes teach the method as claimed in Claim 13, wherein content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices (Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84 which cannot be provided by the previous network processor 92) comprises content having a transport protocol that is not compatible with any of the plurality of network rendering devices. (Pham - Page 5 paragraph [0050] lines 1-12, lines 19-12. Here, IPsec protocol is the transport protocol used to transfer packets to crypto processor 86 which is not compatible with one network device)

9.   With respect to Claim 17, Pham and Hughes teach the limitation as described in Claim 13 above. However, Pham does not explicitly state about said periodic filtering of information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of information describing characteristics of content that cannot be

rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices is repeated over a

"predefined time interval".

10.   Conversely, Hughes does in fact teach such a limitation. (Hughe's

teachings on Figure 10, Scan Interval of 5 minutes).

11.   Pham and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and

devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hughes with

Pham in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the

unapproved sites from the users.

12.   With respect to Claim 19, Pham and Hughes teach a method as claimed

in claim 13 wherein said periodic filtering of information describing

characteristics of content to yield filtered information devoid of information about

content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering

devices is performed when a new network rendering device is added to the

network.   (Pham's teachings on Figure 1, Page 3 – paragraph [0039] lines 8-12.

Here, the establishment of new network connection includes the remote gateway

20).

13.   With respect to Claim 22, Pham and Hughes teach a method as claimed

in claim 13, further comprises the act of selecting content for transfer via the

network to any of the network rendering devices, (Pham - Page 5, paragraph

[0050] lines 19-22); wherein said selecting is based on the searching or browsing

step, (Pham - Page 8, paragraph [0068] lines 14-19); and wherein said content

selected for transfer is renderable by any of the network rendering devices.

(Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0052] lines 1-4).

14.   With respect to Claim 23, Pham and Hughes teach a method as claimed

in claim 13 wherein the act of storing removed information comprises the act of :

filtering information describing characteristics of the content to yield filtered

information including information describing characteristics of content (Pham -

Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-12); that cannot be rendered by any of the

plurality of network rendering devices, (Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines

12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84 which

cannot be provided by the previous network processor 92); and making available

on the network said filtered information including information describing

characteristics of content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of

network rendering devices. (Pham Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-6]. The

stored information is available on the network).

15.   Pham and Hughes teach the limitation of Claim 23 as described above.

However, Pham does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering.

16.   However, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval.

(Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-

17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is

the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes

further teaches filtering / attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-57. i.e. filtering the information).

17.   Pham and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hughes with Pham in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

18.   With respect to Claim 24, Pham and Hughes teach a method as claimed in claim 23, wherein said method further comprises the act of : initiating an action based on said filtered information including information describing characteristics of content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices, wherein the action comprises **any** of the following: upgrading the network; b) downloading and/or installing a codec; c) adapting a security parameter; (Pham - Page 1 – paragraph [0008] lines 1-10, Page – paragraph [0039] lines 18-22) d) recommending the purchase or upgrade of at least one network rendering device; and e) providing a human-perceptible explanation of why content is unusable by the at least one network rendering device.

19.   With respect to Claim 25, Pham   teaches a device adapted for filtering and storing information describing characteristics of content accessible via a network, said content being potentially useable by a plurality of network

rendering devices adapted for rendering content, the device comprising: a) at

least one filtering element adapted to filter the information describing

characteristics of the content to yield filtered information devoid of content

(Figure 1, Figure 2, Page 3 – paragraph [0036], paragraph [0038], Page 5,

paragraph [0050] lines 1-12) that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of

network rendering devices; (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data

is explicitly provided by the control processor 84 which cannot be provided by the

previous network processor 92);   and b) a storage element containing a

content directory including the filtered information devoid of information

describing characteristics of content that cannot be rendered by any of the

plurality of network rendering devices (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-6]);

wherein the content directory is searchable or browseable to enable review of

said filtered information describing characteristics devoid of information

describing characteristics of the content that cannot be rendered by any of the

plurality of network rendering devices, (Page 7, paragraph [0064], Page 8,

paragraph [0068] lines 14-19); and searching or browsing of the content

directory to review said filtered information devoid of information about content

that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices is

performed independently of said periodic filtering by the at least one filtering

element. (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly

provided by the control processor 84 which is performed independently); to yield

filtered information devoid of information describing characteristics of content

(Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-12);   that cannot be rendered by any of the

plurality of network rendering devices. (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19.

Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84 which cannot be

provided by the previous network processor 92); and wherein the content

directory is searchable or browseable to enable review of said removed

information (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly

provided by the control processor 84 which is performed independently).

20.   Pham teaches the limitations of Claim 25 as described above. However,

Pham does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering.

21.   However, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval.

(Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-

17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes.   i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is

the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes

further teaches filtering / attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-

57. i.e. filtering the information).

22.   Pham and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and

devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hughes with

Pham in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the

unapproved sites from the users.

23.   With respect to Claim 26, Pham and Hughes teach a media server

embodying the device of claim 25. (Pham - Figure 1, Page 1 – paragraph [0009]

lines 3-8).

24.   With respect to Claim 27, Pham and Hughes teach a network comprising

the device of claim 25 (Pham - Figure 1); and at least one network rendering

device (Pham -Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly

provided by the control processor 84).

25.   Claims 28 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Pham and Hughes in further view of Carbonneau et al. (US

5835700).

26.   With respect to Claims 28 and 31, Pham and Hughes teach the limitations

of Claim 13 and 25 respectively. Pham and Hughes also teach about accessing

the removed information. However, Pham and Hughes do not explicitly state

about and determining upgrades of the network based on the accessing act.

27.   Conversely, Carbonneau teaches this limitation. Carbonneau teaches a

Local Area Network consisting of client/server and storage system containing

plurality of removable storage units. Carbonneau also teaches determining

upgrades of the network based on the accessing act. (Column 17, lines 17-25.

Here the network manager determines whether an upgrade to the network such

as adding an additional storage capacity based on the usage traffic to a drive

containing licensed software).

28.   Pham and Hughes have common grounds of teaching about filtering and

storing information on servers and devices. Carbonneau teaches about storing

units. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Carbonneau

with Pham, and Hughes by implementing a system where the administrator or

network manager evaluates the network and determines an upgrade based on

network compatibility by replacing the appropriate device in order to improve

network performance.

29.   Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Pham and Hughes in further view of Barton (US 2005/0193060).

30.   With respect to Claim 29, Pham and Hughes teach the limitations of Claim

13 as described above. However Pham and Hughes do not explicitly state about

hidden content hidden from a user when performing the searching or browsing

act.

31.   Conversely, Barton teaches the above limitation. Barton teaches a

network consisting of various controlling devices and storage units. Barton also

teaches hidden content hidden from a user when performing the searching or

browsing act. (Page 4 – paragraph [0035]. Here the user can access and add

content to a document before transmitting to a temporary storage unit but cannot

access the documents on other user's control units. Keeping content hidden from

the other participants allows the user to browse the content on the control unit

before moving the content.

32.   Pham and Hughes have common grounds of teaching about filtering and

storing information on servers and devices. Barton also teaches about storing

file content in storage areas and servers. It would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have

combined the teachings of Barton with Pham and Hughes by implementing a

system where authorized users have access to hidden content from other

participants in order to preserve user's privacy.

33.   Claims 14, 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Pham and Hughes in further view of Abdulrahiman et al. (US

2003/0023671)

34.   With respect to Claim 14, Pham and Hughes teach the limitations as

described in Claim 13. However Pham and Hughes do not explicitly state in

their teachings about the content which is not compatible with the plurality of

network rendering devices.

35.   Conversely Abdulrahiman does in fact teach such a limitation.

Abdulrahiman teaches wireless transmission of contents among portable

devices. Abdulrahiman also teaches about the content which is not compatible

with the network rendering devices. (Page 4, paragraph [0038], lines 12-21,

Paragraph [0039], lines 3-5. Here if a file compatibility error has occurred, the

application content is incompatible as configured by network rendering devices).

36.   Pham, Hughes and Abdulrahiman have common grounds of storing

contents among the servers and storage devices. It would have been obvious to

a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have

combined the teachings of Abdulrahiman with Pham and Hughes in order to

prevent certain data information from being transmitted to the destination by

following certain supported data formats.

37.   With respect to Claims 30 and 32, Pham and Hughes teach the limitations

of Claim 13 and 25 respectively. Pham and Hughes also teach about   periodic

filtering and storing removed content in a different directory. However, Pham,

and Hughes do not explicitly state about the filtered content or filtered element is

unusable by any of the plurality of network rendering devices.

38.   Conversely Abdulrahiman does in fact teach such a limitation.

Abdulrahiman teaches wireless transmission of contents among portable

devices. Abdulrahiman also teaches about the content which is not usable by any

of the network rendering devices. (Page 4, paragraph [0038], lines 12-21,

Paragraph [0039], lines 3-5. Here if a file compatibility error has occurred, the

application content cannot be used as configured by network rendering devices).

39.   Pham, Hughes and Abdulrahiman have common grounds of storing

contents among the servers and storage devices. It would have been obvious to

a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have

combined the teachings of Abdulrahiman with Pham and Hughes in order to

prevent certain data information from being transmitted to the destination by

following certain supported data formats.

40.   Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Pham and Hughes in further view of Safadi (US 2003/0126086).

41.   With respect to Claim 16, Pham and Hughes teach the limitations as

described in Claim 13. However, Pham and Hughes do not explicitly state

about teaching a method according to claim 1, wherein a content having a DRM

system, which is not supported by any of the network rendering devices.

42.   Conversely Safadi does in fact teach such a limitation. In one

embodiment, Safadi teaches about copy protection of contents and Digital

Rights Management (DRM) over communication network and devices. (Page 2,

paragraph [0021, lines 1-2). In another embodiment, Safadi teaches about a

content having a DRM scheme or system, which is not supported by any of the

network rendering devices (Page 3 – paragraph [0038] lines 2-7, Network device

200 - Figure 1). Here the original DRM scheme of a particular content is

converted to a native DRM scheme only if the consumer's Network device 200 is

not compatible or not supported.

43.   Pham and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers

and devices. Safadi teaches about copy protection of content information. It

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined the teachings of Safadi with Pham and

Hughes in order to interface with multiple content providers and provide copy

protection of content.

44.   Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Pham and Hughes in further view of Gorman (US

2002/0143780).

45.   With respect to Claim 18, Pham and Hughes teach the limitations as

described in Claim 13. However, Pham and Hughes do not explicitly state about

teaching a content which is performed when a network rendering device is

removed from the network.

46.   Conversely Gorman teaches the above limitation. Gorman teaches a

system and method for filtering and sorting data. Gorman also teaches about a

content which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from

the network. (Page 4, paragraph [0055], lines 12-14 and Figures 4 A and 4B.

Here Figures 4A and 4B reflect user deleted criteria from the filter cells).

47.   Pham and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and

devices. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data.   It

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined the teachings of Gorman with Pham and

Hughes in order to manage the data and filter multiple columns of data grids so

that it satisfies the selected filter criteria.

48.   With respect to Claim 20, Pham and Hughes teach the limitations as

described in Claim 13. Also, Pham and Hughes teach a method of filtering

(Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-12); and storing information

describing characteristics of content is performed (Pham - Page 5, paragraph

[0050] lines 1-6]); for a predefined time interval (Hughes teachings on Figure 10,

Scan Interval, Column 5, lines 10-12).

49.   However Pham and Hughes do not explicitly state about filtering which is

performed when a network device has been removed.

50.   Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data.

Gorman also teaches about a content which is performed when a network

rendering device is removed from the network. (Page 4, paragraph [0055], lines

12-14 and Figures 4 A and 4B. Here Figures 4A and 4B reflect user deleted

criteria from the filter cells).

51.   Pham and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and

devices. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. It

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined the teachings of Gorman with Pham and

Hughes in order to manage the data and filter multiple columns of data grids so

that it satisfies the selected filter criteria.

52.   Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Pham and Hughes in further view of Phan et al. (US 2004/0193609).

53.   With respect to Claim 21,Pham and Hughes teach the limitations as

described in Claim 13.   However, Pham and Hughes do not explicitly state in

their teachings wherein the network is a UPnP network and the information

about the content is stored by a UPnP content directory service.

54.   Conversely Phan does in fact teach such a limitation. Phan teaches a

master content directory service representing all of the content within the

network. (Abstract lines 1-3). Phan also teaches a UPnP architecture defining

general interaction between UPnP control points and UPnP network devices

(Page 2 – paragraph [0020], Page 3 - paragraph [0024]); and the information

about content is stored by an UPnP content directory service Page 2 – paragraph

[0020] lines 12-16, Page 5 – paragraph [0040] lines 7-12).

55.   Pham and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and

devices over a network. Phan also teaches storing information content in a

communication network. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of

Phan with Pham and Hughes by employing a UPnP network which is self

configuring and has the network controller which is capable of discovering and

controlling other devices.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CLARENCE JOHN whose telephone number is (571)270-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:00 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Tonia Dollinger can be reached on 571-272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CJ/
Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2443
3/22/2012

/PHUOC NGUYEN/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2443